

**Remarks**

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1-16 stand rejected. Claims 1, 12, and 16 have been amended. Claim 17 is new. Support for the amendments and the new claim can be found in the specification. No new matter has been added.

***CLAIMS 1-5, 7-9, 12, AND 16***

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 102 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,670,974 issued to McKnight.

McKnight discloses a method and system in which a "persistent usage context . . . may be stored." McKnight, col. 2, lines 56-58. That usage context, for example, "may act to load previously accessed web sites into a user's web browser to enable the user to utilize the forward and backward buttons as if the [previous] web session were still active." McKnight, col. 3, lines 6-9.

As amended Claim 1 is directed to a system for providing a history list of imaging compositions for a user and requires the following limitations:

1. a history list of the imaging compositions, each imaging composition having links to imaging data to be serviced as a single unit, the imaging data associated with the user through a user profile;
2. a composition store for storing said history list and said existing imaging compositions, wherein said composition store maintains said history list, and
3. a personal imaging repository providing for the composition store an exchange infrastructure between the imaging data associated with the user and available web services.

Rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that McKnight, col. 4, lines 43-44 and col. 9, lines 61-67 teaches "a system that provides a history of existing imaging compositions . . . linked to imaging data serviced as a single unit . . . that can later be retrieved by a user associated with the history list." McKnight,

col. 4, lines 43-44 describes a figure illustrating a usage history communicated in chronological order. Col. 9, lines 61-67 discloses that "information pertaining to content related to the item of usage may be communicated." That communication may indicate, for example, that the item of usage contains a sound file and a number of links as well as information as to what those links pertain.

As indicated in the sections cited by the Examiner, McKnight does teach a usage context that can provide a history of items such as accessed web sites. However McKnight fails to teach the specific history list required by the first limitation of Claim 1. That is, McKnight does not teach a history list of imaging compositions where each imaging composition includes links to imaging data to be serviced as a single unit and where the imaging data associated with a user through a user profile as required by the first limitation above.

The Examiner asserts that McKnight, col. 3, lines 1-3 teaches a "composition store to be an exchange infrastructure between the imaging data and web services that are available." The cited section is taken from a paragraph from McKnight's summary section that discloses a method and system in which a "persistent usage context . . . may be stored." McKnight, col. 2, lines 56-58. That usage context, for example, "may act to load previously accessed web sites into a user's web browser to enable the user to utilize the forward and backward buttons as if the [previous] web session were still active." McKnight, col. 3, lines 6-9.

McKnight, however does not teach a personal imaging repository that provides, for a composition store, an exchange infrastructure between the imaging data associated with the user and available web services as required by the third limitation of Claim 1. Specifically, McKnight does not teach an exchange infrastructure between imaging data and web services.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is felt to distinguish over McKnight. Each of Claims 2-5 and 7-9 depend at least indirectly from Claim 1 and include all of the limitation of that base claim. For the reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claims 2-5 and 7-9.

As amended Claim 12 is directed to a method for providing a history list of imaging compositions and requires the following limitations:

1. receiving, on behalf of a user, a new imaging composition from a network service, the imaging composition having links to imaging data to be serviced as a single unit, the imaging data associated with the user through a user profile;
2. saving said new imaging composition to a composition store of a personal imaging repository associated with the user through the user profile;
3. adding said new imaging composition to a history list maintained by the composition store; and,
4. providing the history list to the user associated with the personal imaging repository responsive to a request for the history list.

Rejecting Claim 12, the Examiner cites McKnight, col. 4, lines 43-44 and col. 9, lines 37-39 and 61-67, and Fig. 15. As noted above, McKnight, col. 4, lines 43-44 describes a figure illustrating a usage history communicated in chronological order. Col. 9, lines 37-39 discloses that a representation can be generated "indicating an Adobe® Photoshop® image 1108, received 1110, and then stored on a drive 1112." Col. 9, lines 61-67 discloses that "information pertaining to content related to the item of usage may be communicated." That communication may indicate, for example, that the item of usage contains a sound file and a number of links as well as information as to what those links pertain.

However, nothing in the section cited by the Examiner or anywhere else in McKnight teaches the first limitation of Claim 12. Specifically, McKnight fails to teach receiving, on behalf of a user, a new imaging composition from a network service where the imaging composition has links to imaging data associated with the user through a user profile. Moreover, McKnight fails to teach the second limitation that requires saving such an imaging composition to a composition store of a personal imaging repository associated with the user through the user profile.

For at least these reasons, Claim 12 is felt to distinguish over McKnight. Claim 16 is directed to a computer program product having instructions for

implementing the method steps of Claim 12. For the same reasons Claim 12 is patentable, so is Claim 16.

***CLAIMS 6, 10, 11, AND 13-15***


Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 103 as being unpatentable over McKnight in view of USPN 5,903,889 issued to Huerga. Claims 10, 11, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 103 as being unpatentable over McKnight in view of USPN 6,049,812 issued to Bertram. Claims 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 103 as being obvious over McKnight.

Claims 6, 10 and 11 each depend at least indirectly from Claim 1 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. Claims 13-15 each depend from Claim 12 and include all of the limitations of that base Claim. For the same reasons Claims 1 and 12 are patentable, so are Claims 6, 10, 11, and 13-15.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-17 define allowable subject matter. The Examiner is requested to indicate the allowability of all claims in the application and to pass the application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,  
Shell S. Simpson

By   
Jack H. McKinney  
Reg. No. 45,685

May 20, 2004